

Remarks

Reconsideration and allowance of the above referenced application are respectfully requested.

Claims 7-14 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Mitchell. The claims are amended herein to emphasize the patentable distinctions thereof. This amendment further distinguishes over the Mitchell prior art.

The Mitchell prior art shows a number of lamps on supports. However, those lamps are not control to move as a group, as now claimed. Claim 7, for example, defines that each of the lamps of the group are controlled to move as a group even though each lamp has been pointed in a different direction. Mitchell does not disclose or make obvious controlling lamps which are pointing in different directions to move as a group, as now claimed.

Claim 10 has been amended to recite "controlling the group of lamps as a group using a common control". Mitchell does not disclose or make obvious controlling lamps which are pointing in different directions to move as a group, as now claimed.

Moreover, the rejection admits that Mitchell does not show a graduated scale, stating that this would be obvious. Even if the provision of adjustability involves routine skill, the graduated scale as claimed goes well beyond mere adjustability. In fact, the graduated scale allows each of a number of lamps to be precisely pointed in different directions, at precise locations that can be set according to that graduated scale. This is much

more than routine adjustability and the rejection admits that this is not shown in Mitchell.

For all of these reasons, all of the claims should be allowable.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed in this paper. However, failure to address a specific rejection, issue or comment, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not intended to be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

For all of these reasons, it is respectfully suggested that all of the claims should be in condition for allowance. A formal notice of allowance is hence respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that communications such as a telephone interview or email would facilitate disposal of this case, the undersigned respectfully encourages the Examiner to contact the undersigned.

Recognizing that Internet communications are not secure, I hereby authorize the USPTO to communicate with me concerning any

subject matter of this application by electronic mail (using the email address harris@schiplaw.com). I understand that a copy of these communications will be made of record in the application file.

Please charge any fees due in connection with this response, (excluding any fees paid via EFS), to Deposit Account No. 50-4376.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _6/4/08 _____ _/Scott C Harris/_____
Scott C. Harris
Reg. No. 32,030

Customer No. 74162
Law Office of Scott C. Harris
P.O. Box 1389
Rancho Santa Fe, CA 92067
Telephone: (858) 756-7778
Facsimile: (858) 756-7717